

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vriginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/739,223	12/18/2000	Gerald Batist	701826-05008-CIP 3120	
7590 11/20/2003			EXAMINER	
Nixon Peabody LLP			CHEN, SHIN LIN	
c/o David S. Resnick 101 Federal Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Boston, MA 02110-1000			1632	
			DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/739,223	BATIST ET AL.
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shin-Lin Chen	1632
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sh et with th	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR		
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b		,
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s): See Continuation Sheet.	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .		
Claim(s) objected to: None.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20 and 23-25</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>21 and 22</u> .		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appl	oved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	•	
10. Other:	(0)(1 10 1770) aper 110(5)	Sriker
		Shin-Lin Chen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1632

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Application No. 009/739,223

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Claims 26-31 are drawn to a method of screening for tumor-specific expression of a gene in vitro by introducin a construct comprising the rat Hex II promoter to a sample of cells and screening said sample of cells for selective expression of said gene. Claims 26-31 are drawn to a distinct invention from the elected invention that was examined, therefore, claims 26-31 will be withdrawn from consideration if entered. Further, the phrase "said tumor" in claim 28 lack antecedent basis and raise new 112 second paragraph issue..

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) rejections if the amendment is entered.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that the in vivo success of the cliamed method is described in Figs. 6A-6H and 7A and page 31 lines 12-31 describes the utility of the cliamed method (amendment, p. 4). this is not found persuasive because of the reasons of record. Example I of the present invention teaches intratumoral injection of the expression vector expressing Tk protein but fails to provide enabling evidence for tumor-specific activity of the Hex II promoter and reduction in tumor volume via various administration routes in vivo other than intratumoral injection. This is a 35 U.S.C. 112 first enablement rejection, the argument regarding the utility of the cliamed invention is confusing and is irrelevant to the enablement rejection